

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 16, 19-22, 28 and 33, 34 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 21, 22 and 28 have been amended while claims 9, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31 and 32 are cancelled in this response as shown on pages 2-8 of the Reply. New claim 33 and 34 are added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as filed at Fig. 12 and related text at page 17 lines 3-10 and page 18 lines 9-12.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1 and 3-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the aforementioned amendments to independent claims 1 and 11.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16, 20, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16, 20, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (U.S. 20050108200) in view of Do *et al.* (U.S. 20020170042). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features recited by the subject claims. The claimed subject matter relates to a distributed object classification systems and provides a method for unrelated tools to categorize elements they control according to a common, centrally managed classification scheme. To this end, independent claim 1 recites: ***an event monitoring system that monitors the common classification structure and automatically provides an opportunity to prevent changes to the common classification structure by communicating at least one notification prior to implementing the changes to the common classification structure.*** Similarly, independent claim 11 recites: ***means for monitoring the plurality of components that automatically communicates notifications to users prior to implementing modifications to the hierarchy such that users have an opportunity to prevent undesirable changes wherein further notifications are provided to the users upon implementing the modifications to the hierarchy.*** Independent claim 16 recites: ***exposing the common***

classification structure among a plurality of unrelated software design tools as one or more typed XML (eXtensible Markup Language) documents wherein the nodes are typed according to the structure type;..... monitoring the common classification structure to detect manipulations of the structure; providing automatic notifications to users upon receiving input manipulating the common classification structure; receiving user feedback in response to the notifications; allowing the manipulation of the common classification structure based on the user feedback; and informing the users of the manipulations to the common classification structure. Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.* alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest such novel features recited by the subject claims.

Meik *et al.* relates to search engines applied to the Internet or corporate intranet domains for retrieving accessible documents using automatic text categorization techniques, to support the presentation of search query results within high-speed network environments. At the cited portions, Meik *et al.* discloses corporate network domains that comprise documents in various formats and stored across various servers, and a system that filters the documents, performs content-related analysis and stored the documents in a knowledge database. Further, Meik *et al.* discloses automatic text classification of text documents into a set of categories or index terms, applying inductive learning techniques for automatically creating classifiers which use labeled training data and a search engine that performs document categorization. However, Meik *et al.* fails to teach or suggest monitoring a classification structure and informing of modifications to classification structures as recited in subject independent claims.

Do *et al.* relates to a system of designing and producing software code and fails to makeup for the aforementioned deficiencies of Meik *et al.* At the cited portions, Do *et al.* discloses a reverse-engineering system that inputs a previously-developed software code comprising a plurality of instructions, determines the objects in the code and a relationship between the objects, and generates a design model. An axiomatic design tool provides the design model that can be utilized to test and extend the software code so that it can be reused in other applications. By populating an axiomatic design equation, the software developer is able to identify objects within the software code and determine the coupling between the objects. Nowhere does Do *et al.* disclose an event monitoring system as recited in the subject independent claims.

In accordance with the claimed subject matter, an event monitoring system receives information concerning a change to a structural artifact. If a notification-worthy event occurs that matches a subscription, notification data can be provided to a client associated with the subscription. For example, a before change event can be raised to all consumers of the structure to give them an opportunity to veto the change or approve the change. Additionally or alternatively, an after change event can be raised to all consumers to enable them to reflect a change that has been committed. For instance they can ensure that any artifact that refers to a node id is still valid. (See applicants' specification as filed Fig. 15 and related description at page 19 line 33 – page 20 line 5).

Additionally, independent claim 16 recites: *exposing the common classification structure among a plurality of unrelated software design tools as one or more typed XML (eXtensible Markup Language) documents wherein the nodes are typed according to the structure type*. New dependent claim 34 recites similar features. The claimed subject matter relates to generating common structures intended for use by a multitude of similar or varying components and subcomponents. As a result, the common structures can be exposed to consumers and manipulators as XML (eXensible Markup Language) documents. Furthermore, in order to make XML documents more accessible to users they can be typed. Thus, instead of seeing XML elements with tags of the general types node, node type, and property type a consumer will see nodes that are typed according to their structure type. (See for example XML nodes for structure type Project Model Hierarchy on page 18). The cited art does not teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by applicants' subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 7, 9-12, 14-15, 21, 23-25, 27, and 30-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 9-12, 14-15, 21, 23-25, 27, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (US 20050108200) in view of Gargi *et al.* (US 20050027712) further in view of Do *et al.* (US 20020170042). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. As discussed *supra*, Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited in independent claims 1, 11, and

16. Independent claim 28 recites similar features namely: *detecting one or more changes to the structure; automatically notifying one or more of users or owners of the artifacts regarding changes to the structure; receiving feedback from the owners or users regarding the notifications; preventing changes to the common structure if the users or owners veto the changes in the feedback; implementing the changes if no veto is received; and informing the owners and users of the changes implemented to the common structure.* Gargi *et al.* fails to makeup for the aforementioned deficiencies of Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*

Meik *et al.* relates to search engines applied to the Internet or corporate intranet domains for retrieving accessible documents using automatic text categorization techniques, to support the presentation of search query results within high-speed network environments. As discussed *supra* with respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 16, Meik *et al.* is silent regarding the aforementioned features recited by the subject claims.

Do *et al.* relates to a system of designing and producing software code. However, as discussed *supra*, Do *et al.* is also silent regarding *notifying one or more of users or owners of the artifacts regarding changes to the structure.* Therefore, it fails to teach or suggest further steps such as receiving feedback from the owners or users regarding the notifications; preventing changes to the common structure if the users or owners veto the changes in the feedback; implementing the changes if no veto is received; and informing the owners and users of the changes implemented to the common structure.

Gargi *et al.* relates to systems and methods for organizing a collection of objects and fails to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.* Gargi *et al.* teaches an object manager that arranges objects into a sequence that is ordered in accordance with context related metadata associated with the object and automatically segments them into clusters. The context related metadata is then accessed to extract names for the clusters, and the objects are then arranged in a hierarchical structure. The objects classified by the system disclosed by Gargi *et al.*, are media objects or business process entities. On page 12 of the Final Office Action dated September 18, 2008, it is erroneously contended that Gargi *et al.* teaches the aforementioned claimed aspects related to detecting changes to the artifacts. At the cited portion, Gargi *et al.* teaches modeling a business process into a directed graph having different types of nodes including work nodes, route notes etc. In particular, the graph models an expense approval process wherein a notification is effected by a service such as send_email wherein an

email is sent to the requester that the expense approval process has begun. The process loops among the list of individuals until either/all of the approvers approve the expense request or until one of the approvers rejects the request. The final decision is reported to the requester before the process terminates at the completion node. Such is not monitoring the common structure to detect one or more changes to the structure as recited in independent claim 28. Rather, a requester initiates the expense approval process in accordance with Gargi *et al.* whereas the claimed subject matter facilitates automatically notifying users of attempts to change a common classification structure.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Meik *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Do *et al.*, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all elements set forth in the applicants' independent claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (US 20050108200) in view of Gargi *et al.* (US 20050027712) further in view of Omoigui *et al.* (US 20030126136). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Meik, *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19 and 22 depend from independent claims 1, 11, and 16 respectively. As discussed *supra*, Meik, *et al.* and Gargi *et al.* do not disclose all the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 16. Omoigui *et al.* relates to knowledge retrieval, management and presentation of domain specific semantic information and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Meik, *et al.* and Gargi *et al.* with respect to the independent claims 1, 11, and 16. Thus, it can be concluded that the claimed subject matter is not obvious over the combination of Meik, *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.* Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. New claim 33

Newly added claim 33 emphasizes novel aspects of the invention discussed *supra* in connection with claims 1-28. In particular, claim 33 recites receiving user input regarding a node within the common classification structure via the graphical user interface. None of the cited documents teach nor suggest such claimed aspects. Accordingly, this claim is patentably distinct over the art of record for at least the same reasons as are claims 1-28.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP636US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Bhavani S. Rayaprolu/
Bhavani S. Rayaprolu
Reg. No. 56,583

TUROC Y & WATSON, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731